arXiv:1510.08093v2 [math.AP] 19 Nov 2015

GROSS-PITAEVSKII VORTEX MOTION WITH CRITICALLY-SCALED INHOMOGENEITIES

MATTHIAS KURZKE, JEREMY L. MARZUOLA, AND DANIEL SPIRN

Abstract. We study the dynamics of vortices in an inhomogeneous Gross-Pitaevskii equation $i\partial_t u = \Delta u + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}(p_\varepsilon^2(x) - |u|^2)$. For a unique scaling regime $|p_\varepsilon(x) - 1| = O(|\log \varepsilon|^{-1})$, it is shown that vortices can interact both with the background perturbation and with each other. Results for associated parabolic and elliptic problems are discussed.

1. Introduction

We consider the behavior of vortices in an inhomogeneous Gross-Pitaevskii (IGP) equation

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u = \Delta u + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}(p^2(x) - |u|^2)u & \text{in } \Omega \\ \nu \cdot \nabla u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}, \tag{1.1}$$

where Ω is a bounded, simply connected domain in $\mathbf{R}^2$.

We are interested in the critical asymptotic regime where vortices interact with both the background potential $p(x)$ and each other. This corresponds to studying how vortices transition over small material defects, whose size is related to the length scale associated to the vortex cores. In the following, we will take $p(x) = p_\epsilon(x)$ with

$$|1 - p_\varepsilon^2(x)| \lesssim \frac{1}{|\log \varepsilon|}; \tag{1.2}$$

asymptotic scales of $p_\varepsilon(x)$ outside of the range (1.2) induce dynamics that are dominated by only the background potential or by only vortex-vortex interactions.

1.1. Background potential.

Following Lassoued-Mironescu [25] we write

$$u(x,t) = \eta_\varepsilon(x) w(x,t),$$

J.L.M. was support in part by NSF Applied Math Grant DMS-1312874 and NSF CAREER Grant DMS-1352353. D.S. was supported in part by NSF CAREER grant DMS-0955687 and NSF grant DMS-1516565. The authors wish to thank Sylvia Serfaty and Rafe Mazzeo for helpful conversations throughout the development of this work.

where η_ε is a minimizer of an energy (A.2) and consequently a nontrivial solution to the following elliptic PDE,

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \Delta\eta_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\eta_\varepsilon(p_\varepsilon^2 - \eta_\varepsilon^2) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \nu \cdot \nabla\eta_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}, \tag{1.3}$$

then the profile decomposition yields the Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{cases} i\eta_\varepsilon^2\partial_t w = \operatorname{div}(\eta_\varepsilon^2\nabla w) + \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^4}{\varepsilon^2}(1-|w|^2)w & \text{in } \Omega \\ \nu \cdot \nabla w = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}. \tag{1.4}$$

The local and global well-posedness of (1.4) for fixed ε can be established using a variation of the argument in Brezis-Gallouet [7].

Associated to (1.4) is a weighted Hamiltonian,

$$e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) := \frac{1}{2}\eta_\varepsilon^2\left|\nabla w\right|^2 + \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^4}{4\varepsilon^2}\left(1-|w|^2\right)^2;$$

consequently, $e_\varepsilon^1(w)$ is the standard gauge-less Ginzburg-Landau energy density as in [4]. We set

$$E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) := \int_\Omega e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w)dx$$

to be the total energy of the mapping w associated to background potential η_ε. We will be interested in an asymptotic range of $p_\varepsilon(x)$'s such that the resulting energy feels both the background potential and the other vortices at the same order. As will be elicited below, our regime corresponds to having the background η_ε expanded in the following way: $\eta_\varepsilon^2(x) = 1 + \frac{Q_\varepsilon(x)}{|\log\varepsilon|}$ with $Q_\varepsilon(x) \to Q_0(x)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

1.2. **Conservation Laws.** There are a set of conservation laws for (1.4), and to write them down efficiently, we introduce some notation. For $b, c \in \mathbb{C}$ set $(\cdot,\cdot) = \frac{1}{2}\left(b\overline{c} + \overline{b}c\right)$ and let us define

$$j(u) := (iu, \nabla u) \equiv \text{ supercurrent },$$
$$J(u) := \det\nabla u = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{curl} j(u) \equiv \text{ Jacobian },$$

then solutions satisfy the following differential identities:

$$\frac{\eta_\varepsilon^2}{2}\partial_t\left(|w|^2-1\right) = \operatorname{div}\left(\eta_\varepsilon^2 j(w)\right), \tag{1.5}$$

$$\partial_t e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) = \operatorname{div}(\eta_\varepsilon^2(\nabla w, \partial_t w)). \tag{1.6}$$

A third conservation law holds for the Jacobian, we which we now define, tensorially. Let matrix $\mathbb{J}_{ij}$ with $\mathbb{J}_{21} = -\mathbb{J}_{12} = 1$ and $\mathbb{J}_{11} = \mathbb{J}_{22} = 0$ then $\operatorname{curl} F = \mathbb{J}_{k\ell}\partial_\ell F_k$ and if

$J(w) = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{curl} j(w)$, then following Jerrard-Smets [15] we have after a lengthy calculation

$$\partial_t J(w) = \mathbb{J}_{\ell j}\partial_j\left[\frac{1}{\eta_\varepsilon^2}\partial_k\left(\eta_\varepsilon^2\partial_\ell w, \partial_k w\right)\right] - \mathbb{J}_{\ell j}\partial_j\left[\eta_\varepsilon^2\partial_\ell\frac{\left(1-|w|^2\right)^2}{4\varepsilon^2}\right]. \tag{1.7}$$

Multiplying by $\phi \in C_0^2(\Omega)$ yields a conservation law observed in [15]

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \phi\partial_t J(w)dx = &\int_{\mathbf{R}^2}\mathbb{J}_{\ell j}\partial_j\partial_k\phi\left(\partial_k w, \partial_\ell w\right)dx \\ &- \int_\Omega \mathbb{J}_{\ell j}\partial_j\phi\left[\frac{\partial_k\eta_\varepsilon^2}{\eta_\varepsilon^2}\left(\partial_\ell w, \partial_k w\right) + \partial_\ell\eta_\varepsilon^2\frac{\left(1-|w|^2\right)^2}{4\varepsilon^2}\right]dx.\end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

The dynamics of a vortex can be inferred by choosing suitable test functions ϕ in (1.8) which elicit the vortex positions. Since we expect the Jacobian $J(w)$ to be roughly equal to a delta function, localized at the site of each vortex α, we can choose $\phi = x_m\chi(x-\alpha)$, $m \in \{1,2\}$ for smooth cutoff function $\chi(x) = 1$ in B_r and compactly supported in B_{2r}. Integrating the left hand side over the support yields, formally, $\pi\dot{\alpha}$. On the right hand side, the first term has support in an annulus about each vortex, due to the structure of the test function, and since the energy concentrates outside of the support of the annulus, one sees that it generates an $O(1)$ vortex-vortex interaction term. The second term on the right hand side has support inside of a ball about each vortex, and since the energy tensor is large in this region [23], it generates an $O(|\log\varepsilon||\nabla\log\eta_\varepsilon|)$ vortex-potential interaction term. Therefore, for a vortex to interact with both the background potential and other vortices, it requires that $|\nabla\log\eta_\varepsilon| = O(|\log\varepsilon|^{-1})$ for both terms to be of the same order.[1]

In fact if $|\nabla\log\eta_\varepsilon| \ll |\log\varepsilon|^{-1}$ then the vortex dynamics will be dominated by the interaction with the background potential, as in [15], whereas if $|\nabla\log\eta_\varepsilon| \gg |\log\varepsilon|^{-1}$ then vortex dynamics will be driven by its interaction with the current generated by fellow vortices, see [9].

1.3. **Weak Topology.** In order to measure the distance of the vortices to the site of the expected location of the vortices given by the ODE (1.11), we use the flat norm $\dot{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega)$. We denote the norm $\dot{W}^{-1,1}$ unless this topology is used on a subdomain, such as

$$\|\mu\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}(B_r(\alpha))} = \sup_{\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^\infty(B_r(\alpha))}\leq 1}\left\{\int_{B_r(\alpha)}\phi d\mu \text{ such that } \phi \in W_0^{1,\infty}(B_r(\alpha))\right\}.$$

We use a helpful estimate for concentrations in the flat norm, see Brezis-Coron-Lieb [6]. Define

$$r_\alpha := \frac{1}{8}\min\left\{\min_{i\neq j}|\alpha_i - \alpha_j|, \min_j \operatorname{dist}(\alpha_j, \partial\Omega)\right\}, \tag{1.9}$$

then the following holds:

[1]The third term on the right hand side is negligible.

Lemma 1.1. *Suppose α_k, ξ_k are points in Ω. If*

$$\left\| \sum d_k \delta_{\alpha_k} - d_k \delta_{\xi_k} \right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}} \leq \frac{1}{4} r_\alpha,$$

then

$$\left\| \sum d_k \delta_{\alpha_k} - d_k \delta_{\xi_k} \right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}} = \sum_k |\alpha_k - \xi_k|.$$

Proof. For a proof see [15] for example. □

Consequently, the flat norm provides a good way to measure the location of singularities.

1.4. **Energy Expansion.** Given a collection of n vortices with centers $\alpha = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, the Hamiltonian $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w)$ can be expanded out to second order with $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) = H_\varepsilon(\alpha) + o_\varepsilon(1)$ where

$$H_\varepsilon(\alpha) := \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\pi |\log \varepsilon| + \pi Q_0(\alpha_j) + \gamma_0) + W(\alpha, d),$$

which will be established in the sense of Γ-convergence in Proposition 4.3. Here n will be used throughout to represent the number of vortices, $Q_0(x)$ is the limiting rescaled background perturbation, and $W(\alpha, d)$ is the Coulombic renormalized energy that arises in the work of [4] for Dirichlet boundary conditions[2], given by

$$\begin{aligned} W(\alpha, d) &= \lim_{r \to 0} \left[\min_{\substack{v \in H^1(\Omega_r(\alpha); S^1) \\ \deg(v; \partial B_r(\alpha_j)) = d_j}} \int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)} \frac{1}{2} |\nabla v|^2 \, dx - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \pi \log \frac{1}{r} \right] \\ &= - \sum_{j \neq k} d_j d_k \log |\alpha_j - \alpha_k| + \text{ boundary terms.} \end{aligned}$$

In order to express the boundary terms, we define $G(\cdot, \alpha, d) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} G(\cdot, \alpha_j, d_j)$ where

$$\Delta G(\cdot, \alpha_j, d_j) = 2\pi d_j \delta_{\alpha_j} \text{ in } \Omega \text{ with } G = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

If we set $F(x, \alpha_j) = G(x, \alpha_j, d_j) - \log |x - \alpha_j|$, then we can fully express $W(\alpha, d)$ as

$$W(\alpha, d) = - \sum_{j \neq k} d_j d_k \log |\alpha_j - \alpha_k| + \sum_{j,k} d_j F(\alpha_j, \alpha_k). \tag{1.10}$$

[2]See the discussion in the appendix of [38] for the derivation of $W(\alpha, d)$ with Neumann boundary conditions.

1.5. **Discussion.** The inhomogenous Gross-Pitaevskii equation (1.1) arises in several contexts, including the behavior of superfluid ^{4}He near a boundary, Bose-Einstein Condensation (BEC) under a very weak confinement potential, and nonlinear optics. In the first case has been observed experimentally that anomalous behavior of superfluid ^{4}He vortex filament motion indicates that vortex tubes can become pinned to sites on the material boundary, see [42, 36, 41]. Such pinning can be incorporated heuristically by the introduction of a potential $p(x)$ in the Gross-Pitaevskii equation, see [32] or complex Ginzburg-Landau equations, see [14]. In the second case, IGP is a useful model in a BEC in which the vortices interact both with each other and with the trap potential. In the third case, IGP is useful in modeling optical vortices, see [3, 2, 32], and are related to motion of vortices with non-vanishing total charge in inhomogeneous potentials and confinement.

The dynamics of vortices in Gross-Pitaevksii equations have been the subject of much study in past few decades. The connections between the vortex motion in superfluids with $p(x) \equiv 1$ and simplified ODE's were made by Fetter [11] and in BEC by Fetter-Svidzinsky [12]. The critical scalings for vortex dynamics in the $p(x) \equiv 1$ were deduced via matched asymptotics in the work of Neu [29] and Peres-Rubinstein [31].

Rigorous results on vortex dynamics for Gross-Pitaevskii were established when $p(x) \equiv 1$ by Colliander-Jerrard [9] and also Lin-Xin [27] which showed that vortices satisfy the Kirchoff-Onsager ODE for Euler point vortices. When $p(x) = O(1)$ there is a recent result of Jerrard-Smets [15] that showed that vortices travel along level sets of the Thomas-Fermi profile. In the parabolic setting there were rigorous results by Lin [26] and Jerrard-Soner [17] when $p(x) \equiv 1$ and by Jian-Song [21] when $p = O(1)$. Mixed dynamics with $p = O(1)$ and further forcing terms were discussed by Serfaty-Tice [37]. A variational proof of the parabolic dynamics for $p \equiv 1$ was given by Sandier-Serfaty [33].

1.6. **Results.** We wish to describe the dynamics of vortices in (1.4). If the vortices are located at positions $\alpha_j(t)$ with degree $d_j \in \{-1, 1\}$, then the vortices move via the ODE,

$$\pi d_k \dot{\alpha}_k(t) = \nabla^{\perp}_{\alpha_k} H_0(\alpha, Q_0), \tag{1.11}$$

where $\nabla^{\perp} = (\partial_2, -\partial_1)^T$ and

$$H(\alpha) = W(\alpha, d) + \pi \sum_{j=1}^{n} Q_0(\alpha_j). \tag{1.12}$$

Given the ODE generated by (1.11), we can define the collision time,

$$T_{col} := \sup_{t \geq 0} \{ r_{\alpha(s)} > 0 \text{ for all } 0 \leq s \leq t \}.$$

Then for any $0 \leq T < T_{col}$ we can define

$$r_{min} := \min_{t \in [0,T]} r_{\alpha(t)} \tag{1.13}$$

which is the minimum vortex-vortex or vortex-boundary distance until time T. Clearly $r_{min} > 0$.

Our main result is the following that captures both vortex-vortex and vortex-potential interactions. An important hypothesis will be that the initial data has control of the excess energy

$$D_\varepsilon(w,\alpha) \equiv E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) - H_\varepsilon(\alpha); \tag{1.14}$$

we will shorten the notation to D_ε when the w and α are readily apparent.

Theorem 1. *Let $p_\varepsilon^2 = 1 + \frac{\rho_\varepsilon(x)}{|\log\varepsilon|}$ where the ρ_ε satisfies hypotheses of Proposition 1.2 with $k \geq 4$. Let $\{\alpha_j^0, d_j\}$ be a configuration of vortices such that $d_j \in \{-1,1\}$ and suppose $w_\varepsilon^0, 0 < \varepsilon < 1$ satisfies (1.4) with well-preparedness hypotheses*

$$\|J(w_\varepsilon^0) - \pi\sum d_j\delta_{\alpha_j^0}\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}} = o_\varepsilon(1) \text{ and } D_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon^0,\alpha^0) = o_\varepsilon(1) \text{ and } r_{\alpha_0} > 0. \tag{1.15}$$

If $w_\varepsilon(t)$ is a solution to (1.1) with initial data w_ε^0 then there exists a time $T > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\left\| J(w_\varepsilon(\cdot,t)) - \pi\sum d_j\delta_{\alpha_j(t)} \right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega)} \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$, where the $\alpha_j(t)$ are defined by (1.11), and T is independent of ε.

One important example that arises from the Theorem 1 are dipoles that are scattered by inhomogeneities, see Remark 1.1 below and Section 5 for some illustrative numerical simulations.

Under slightly less regularity assumptions, we have a similar result for the gradient flow

$$\frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\partial_t u_\varepsilon = \Delta u_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}(p_\varepsilon^2 - |u_\varepsilon|^2)u_\varepsilon \tag{1.16}$$

with the limit equation

$$\pi\dot{\alpha}_k(t) = -\nabla_{\alpha_k} H_0(\alpha, Q_0), \tag{1.17}$$

Theorem 2. *Let $p_\varepsilon^2 = 1 + \frac{\rho_\varepsilon(x)}{|\log\varepsilon|}$ where the ρ_ε satisfies hypotheses of Proposition 1.2 with $k \geq 3$. If $\{\alpha_j^0, d_j\}$ be a configuration of vortices such that $d_j \in \{-1,1\}$ and if $u_\varepsilon^0, 0 < \varepsilon < 1$ satisfies (1.16) and $w_\varepsilon = \frac{u_\varepsilon}{\eta_\varepsilon}$ satisfies the well-preparedness hypotheses*

$$\|J(w_\varepsilon^0) - \pi\sum d_j\delta_{\alpha_j^0}\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}} = o_\varepsilon(1) \text{ and } D_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon^0,\alpha^0) = o_\varepsilon(1) \text{ and } r_{\alpha_0} > 0, \tag{1.18}$$

then there exists a time $T > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\left\| J(w_\varepsilon(\cdot,t)) - \pi\sum d_j\delta_{\alpha_j(t)} \right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega)} \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$, where the $\alpha_j(t)$ are defined by (1.17).

Remark 1.1. There are straightforward adaptations of Theorem 1 to other contexts, including:

- The Gross-Pitaevskii equation (1.1) on $\Omega \equiv \mathbf{R}^2$. This can be achieved by combining the methods here with the arguments in [5, 20]. In this case vortices move according to the same ODE (1.11); however, the renormalized energy $W(a,d)$ is the classical Coulomb potential,
$$W(\alpha, d) = -\sum_{j \neq k} d_j d_k \log|\alpha_j - \alpha_k|.$$
- Mixed Ginzburg-Landau equations of the form
$$\left(\frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\partial_t + i\partial_t\right) u_\varepsilon = \Delta u_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\left(p_\varepsilon^2(x) - |u_\varepsilon|^2\right) u_\varepsilon$$
as studied in [22, 28] which results in a modified ODE
$$\pi\dot{\alpha}_k(t) - \pi d_k(e_3 \times \dot{\alpha}_k(t)) = -\nabla_{\alpha_k} H(\alpha).$$

Finally, in Section 4 we present first and second order Gamma-convergence results for the energy $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon)$, see Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.3, respectively. These results are similar to those found in [1], albeit ported to the case with critical inhomogeneities.

1.7. **Properties of $\eta_\varepsilon = \eta_\varepsilon(p_\varepsilon)$.** We collect here some information required on the behavior of η_ε, as related to the background fluctuations p_ε. The discussion of the proof will be given in Appendix A and are based off of standard elliptic theory estimates, so we simply state the results that we require for the vortex dynamics here.

We write
$$p_\varepsilon^2 = 1 + \frac{\rho_\varepsilon}{|\log\varepsilon|}, \quad \eta_\varepsilon^2 = 1 + \frac{Q_\varepsilon}{|\log\varepsilon|}. \tag{1.19}$$
We will assume that $\rho_\varepsilon \to \rho_0(x)$ in $H^k(\Omega)$ with k made precise below. Using results such as [10] for the Dirichlet problem, we expect that p_ε and η_ε should be quite close. We make precise the nature in which that is true in the following Proposition, which will be proved in the Appendix.

Proposition 1.2. *Let ρ_ε be such that $\rho_\varepsilon \to \rho_0(x)$ in $H^k(\Omega)$, $\nabla\rho_\varepsilon$ is compactly supported strictly on the interior of Ω for all ε and $\varepsilon^2\rho_\varepsilon \to 0$ in H^{k+1}. Then, for Q_ε as defined in (1.19) satisfying Neumann boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega$, we have $Q_\varepsilon \to \rho_0$ in $H^k(\Omega)$. In particular, we have $Q_\varepsilon \to \rho_0$ in $C^{2,\delta}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $\delta > 0$ for integer $k \geq 4$ as required for the Schrödinger dynamics below and $Q_\varepsilon \to \rho_0$ in $C^{1,\delta}(\overline{\Omega})$, $\delta > 0$ for integer $k \geq 3$ as required for the gradient flow dynamics.*[3]

[3]Note, by interpolation arguments, we can actually run the convergence argument is $H^{3+}(\Omega)$, where by $\cdot+$ we mean $\cdot + \nu$ for any $\nu > 0$. We chose to here work pure with differential operators for convenience. In fact, the sharp estimate would include Schauder theory estimates directly on Hölder norms, but that would require uniform convergence in C^1, which does not seem obvious given that the ∇Q term appears to vanish in the limit preventing the proof of uniform bounds of higher regularity.

Remark 1.2. In the appendix, we will actually decompose $\eta_\varepsilon = 1 + \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon}{|\log\varepsilon|}$, in which case

$$Q_0 = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\left[2\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon + \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon^2}{|\log\varepsilon|}\right];$$

this convention slightly simplifies the resulting elliptic analysis.

Remark 1.3. Similar results hold assuming Dirichlet boundary conditions, but we work here with Neumann as they are the most physically relevant.

Remark 1.4. Note, for applications, we really have in mind $\rho_\varepsilon = \rho_0 \in H^{k+1}(\Omega)$ is any fixed function such that $\nabla\rho_0$ has compact support inside Ω, which definitely fits into the assumptions necessary for Proposition 1.2.

2. Excess Energy Control

In this section we present an excess energy identity similar to [9, 19]. The influence of the background requires some modifications, so we give a full proof. The form of the estimate will be similar to that found in [5].

Recall from (1.9) the quantity

$$r_\alpha = \frac{1}{8}\min\left\{\min_{i\neq j}|\alpha_i-\alpha_j|, \min_i \operatorname{dist}(\alpha_i,\partial\Omega)\right\}.$$

Then, we have

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that $r \le r_a$ and assume there exists $M > 0$ such that $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) \le M|\log\varepsilon|$ for all ε. Then there exists constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\mu_0 > 0$ such that if $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and*

$$\mu \equiv \left\|J(w) - \pi\sum d_j\delta_{\alpha_j}\right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}} \le \mu_0$$

then

$$\int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)} e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(|w|) + \frac{1}{8}\left|\frac{j(w)}{|w|} - j(w_*)\right|^2 dx \le D_\varepsilon + o_{\varepsilon,\mu}(1) \tag{2.1}$$

where $o_{\mu,\varepsilon}(1)$ vanishes as $\varepsilon,\mu\to 0$. We also have

$$\int_\Omega e_\varepsilon^1(|w|)dx \le C, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\|j(w)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C, \qquad 1 \le p < 2. \tag{2.3}$$

Furthermore, there exists points $\xi_j \in B_{r/2}(\alpha_j)$ such that

$$\left\|J(w) - \pi\sum d_j\delta_{\xi_j}\right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}} \le C\varepsilon|\log\varepsilon| \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$\left\| \frac{(\partial_k w, \partial_\ell w)}{|\log \varepsilon|} - \delta_{k\ell} \sum \pi \delta_{\xi_j} \right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}} \leq C |\log \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\delta_{k\ell}$ is the Kronecker delta. Here C is a constant that depends on D_ε and $W(\alpha)$.

Remark 2.1. Note that (2.2) implies L^q strong convergence of $|w_\varepsilon| \to 1$ for all $q < +\infty$.

Proof. Although it is possible to get explicit control on the error $o_\varepsilon(1)$ in (2.1) by a careful analysis as in [19, 24], we are interested in a weaker estimate (2.1).

1. We first decompose the excess energy into

$$\begin{aligned} D_\varepsilon &= E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) - H_\varepsilon(\alpha) \\ &= \int_\Omega e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) dx - \left[\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\pi |\log \varepsilon| + \gamma_0 + \pi Q_0(\alpha_j) \right) + W(\alpha) \right] \\ &= \int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)} e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) - e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_*) dx + \int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)} e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_*) dx - W(\alpha) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\int_{B_\sigma(\alpha_j)} e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) dx - \left(\pi |\log \varepsilon| + \gamma_0 + \pi Q_0(\alpha_j) \right) \right] \\ &= I + II + III, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma \leq r \leq \frac{r_\alpha}{4}$ is an appropriately chosen radius. We will control terms $I - III$ by variants of estimates found in [19, 24, 15]. We will choose

$$\sigma = \max\{ |\log \varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \sqrt{\mu} \} \tag{2.6}$$

in the following.

2. By a simple variation of a standard calculation, see for example [19],

$$\frac{\eta_\varepsilon^2}{2} \left| \frac{j(w)}{|w|} - j(w_*) \right|^2 + e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(|w|) = e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) - e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_*) + \eta_\varepsilon^2 j(w_*) \cdot \left(j(w_*) - \frac{j(w)}{|w|} \right), \tag{2.7}$$

and so our primary concern will be with estimating the integral of (2.7) on a suitable subdomain $\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)$. This last term can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\varepsilon^2 j(w_*) \cdot \left(j(w_*) - \frac{j(w)}{|w|} \right) &= \left(\eta_\varepsilon^2 - 1 \right) j(w_*) \cdot \left(j(w_*) - \frac{j(w)}{|w|} \right) \\ &\quad + j(w_*) \cdot \left(j(w_*) - \frac{j(w)}{|w|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now fix our η_0 and ε_0 in order to be able to cite some estimates from [16, 19]. The tool we wish to use is in the proof of Lemma 4 in [19], which yields an estimate given some

assumptions on the Jacobian and ε. Let K_1 be the constant in the assumptions of Lemma 4 from [19], which depends only on Ω.

We follow an argument in the proof of Theorem 6.1 of [5] for fixing these constants; however, there are several new constraints including the fact that the vortex ball radius, σ, cannot be too small due to the need to control terms like $\|\eta_\varepsilon^2 - 1\|_{L^\infty} \|j(w_*)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\sigma)}$.

We first choose μ_0. Set μ_1 such that

$$4\mu \leq \sqrt{\mu} \leq \min\left\{r, \frac{r_\alpha}{nK_1}\right\} \tag{2.8}$$

for all $0 \leq \mu \leq \mu_1$, i.e. $\mu_1 = \min\left\{\frac{1}{16}, r^2, \frac{r_\alpha^2}{n^2K_1^2}\right\}$. We further restrict $\mu_0 = \min\{\mu_1, \frac{r_\alpha}{8K_2n^5}\}$ where K_2 comes from the assumptions in Theorem 3 of [19], needed for the localization result (2.4).

We now choose an ε_0 to allow us to use the necessary array of estimates. First, we choose ε_2 so that for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_2$,

$$|\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \leq \min\left\{r, \frac{r_\alpha}{nK_1}\right\}. \tag{2.9}$$

We then set $\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2$ so that $\varepsilon E_\varepsilon^1(w) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$. Indeed since $\eta_\varepsilon^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}$ then $E_\varepsilon^1(w) \leq \frac{1}{\min\eta_\varepsilon^4} E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) \leq 4C|\log\varepsilon|$, so there exists an ε_1 such that $\varepsilon E_\varepsilon^1(w) \leq 4C\varepsilon|\log\varepsilon| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ for all $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$. We next fix $\varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$ such that,

$$\varepsilon \log\frac{r_\alpha}{\varepsilon} \leq |\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \tag{2.10}$$

for all $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$.

If $\mu \leq |\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ then we use $s_\varepsilon = |\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ and $\sigma = |\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ in Lemma 4 of [19]. In particular (2.9) and (2.10) imply that the assumptions in Lemma 4 hold, and we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)} j(w_*)\cdot\left(j(w_*) - \frac{j(w)}{|w|}\right)dx\right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4}\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\left|\frac{j(w)}{|w|} - j(w_*)\right|^2 dx + C|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{3}}\left(|\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{2}{3}} + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\right) + \frac{C}{r_\alpha}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4}\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\left|\frac{j(w)}{|w|} - j(w_*)\right|^2 dx + o_{\varepsilon,\mu}(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

If $|\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \leq \mu$ then again the assumptions hold for Lemma 4 of [19], and choose $s_\varepsilon = \mu$ and $\sigma = \sqrt{\mu}$ so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)} j(w_*)\cdot\left(j(w_*)-\frac{j(w)}{|w|}\right)dx\right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4}\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\left|\frac{j(w)}{|w|}-j(w_*)\right|^2 dx + \frac{C}{\sqrt{\mu}}\left(\mu+\sqrt{\varepsilon}\right)+C\frac{\mu}{r_\alpha} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4}\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\left|\frac{j(w)}{|w|}-j(w_*)\right|^2 dx + o_{\varepsilon,\mu}(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Taking the sum over the two errors yields sufficient control on $\int_{\Omega_\sigma} j(w_*)\cdot\left(j(w_*)-\frac{j(w)}{|w|}\right)dx$.

Finally, we note

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\left(\eta_\varepsilon^2-1\right)j(w_*)\cdot\left(j(w_*)-\frac{j(w)}{|w|}\right)dx\right| \\
&\quad\leq C\left\|1-\eta_\varepsilon^2\right\|_{L^\infty}\left\|j(w_*)\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\sigma(\alpha))}\left(1+\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\left|j(w_*)-\frac{j(w)}{|w|}\right|^2 dx\right) \\
&\quad\leq C\frac{\min\{|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{3}},\sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu}}\}}{|\log\varepsilon|}\left(1+\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\left|j(w_*)-\frac{j(w)}{|w|}\right|^2 dx\right) \\
&\quad\leq o_{\varepsilon,\mu}\left(1+\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\left|j(w_*)-\frac{j(w)}{|w|}\right|^2 dx\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates together controls term I.

3. We control II using the explicit control in Lemma 12 [19],

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)} e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_*)dx-\left(W(\alpha)+n\pi\log\frac{1}{\sigma}\right)\right| \\
&=\left|\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\eta_\varepsilon^2\left|\nabla w_*\right|^2 dx-\left(W(\alpha)+n\pi\log\frac{1}{\sigma}\right)\right| \\
&\leq\left|\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_\sigma(\alpha)}\left|\nabla w_*\right|^2 dx-\left(W(\alpha)+n\pi\log\frac{1}{\sigma}\right)\right| \quad + C\left\|1-\eta_\varepsilon^2\right\|_{L^\infty}\left\|j(w_*)\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega_\sigma)} \\
&\leq C\frac{\sigma^2}{r_\alpha^2}+C\frac{1}{\sigma^2|\log\varepsilon|}\leq C\frac{\max\{|\log\varepsilon|^{-\frac{2}{3}},\mu\}}{r_\alpha^2}+C\frac{\min\{|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{2}{3}},\frac{1}{\mu}\}}{|\log\varepsilon|}=o_{\varepsilon,\mu}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

4. We now consider terms III.

Recall that $Q_\varepsilon(x) = |\log\varepsilon|\,(\eta_\varepsilon^2(x)-1)$. We set $q_\varepsilon(r,x_0) = \inf_{x\in B_r(x_0)} Q_\varepsilon(x)$ and $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_r = \frac{\varepsilon}{1+q_\varepsilon(r,x_0)}$. Recall from (2.9) that

$$\left\|J(w)-\pi d_j\delta_{\alpha_j}\right\|_{\dot W^{-1,1}(B_\sigma(\alpha_j))} \le \left\|J(w)-\pi\sum d_k\delta_{\alpha_k}\right\|_{\dot W^{-1,1}(\Omega)} \le \mu \le \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{4} \le \frac{\sigma}{4};$$

therefore, we can invoke Theorem 5 of [16]:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_\sigma(\alpha)} e^1_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\sigma}(w)dx &\ge \pi\log\frac{\sigma}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\sigma} + \gamma_0 - C\frac{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\sigma}{\sigma}\sqrt{\log\frac{\sigma}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\sigma}} - C\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\\ &\ge \pi\log\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} + \gamma_0 + \pi\log(1+\frac{Q_\varepsilon(\sigma,\alpha_j)}{|\log\varepsilon|}) - C\varepsilon|\log\varepsilon| - C\sqrt{\mu},\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\int_{B_\sigma(\alpha)} e^1_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_\sigma}(w)dx \ge \pi\log\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} + \gamma_0 - o_{\varepsilon,\mu}(1). \tag{2.13}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_\sigma(\alpha)} e^{\eta_\varepsilon}_\varepsilon(w)dx - \Big(\pi\log\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} + \gamma_0 + \pi Q_0(\alpha)\Big)\\ &\ge \left(1+\frac{Q_\varepsilon(\sigma,\alpha_j)}{|\log\varepsilon|}\right)\Big(\pi\log\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} + \gamma_0 - o_{\varepsilon,\eta}(1)\Big) - \Big(\pi\log\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} + \gamma_0 + \pi Q_0(\alpha)\Big)\\ &\ge -\pi|q_\varepsilon(\sigma,\alpha_j) - Q_0(\alpha_j)| - C\frac{\log\sigma+1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\\ &\ge -\pi|q_\varepsilon(\sigma,\alpha_j) - Q_0(\alpha_j)| - C\frac{\log|\log\varepsilon|}{|\log\varepsilon|} = -o_{\varepsilon,\mu}(1),\end{aligned}$$

and so (2.1) follows.

5. We next turn to the proof of (2.2) and (2.3). Since

$$\left\|J(w)-\pi d_j\delta_{\alpha_j}\right\|_{\dot W^{-1,1}(B_r(\alpha_j))} \le \left\|J(w)-\pi\sum d_k\delta_{\alpha_j}\right\|_{\dot W^{-1,1}(\Omega)} \le \frac{r}{4}$$

then arguing as in Step 4,

$$\int_{B_r(\alpha_j)} e^{\eta_\varepsilon}_\varepsilon(w)dx \ge \pi|\log\varepsilon| - C(r).$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)} e^{\eta_\varepsilon}_\varepsilon(w)dx = E^{\eta_\varepsilon}_\varepsilon(w) - \sum_{j=1}^n e^{\eta_\varepsilon}_\varepsilon(w)dx \le D_\varepsilon + n\gamma_0 + \pi\sum Q_0(\alpha_j) + W(\alpha) + nC(r),$$

and so,

$$\int_{B_r(\alpha_k)} e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w)dx = E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) - \int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)} e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w)dx - \sum_{j\neq k}\int_{B_r(\alpha_j)} e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w)dx$$
$$\leq \pi|\log\varepsilon| + C(D_\varepsilon, r).$$

Finally, we can use (4.27) in the proof of Proposition 4.2 in [16] which implies

$$\int_{B_r(\alpha_j)} e_\varepsilon^1(|w|)dx \leq C(D_\varepsilon, r).$$

Combining with (2.1) yields (2.2).

To prove (2.3) we use an L^p bound on each vortex ball in Theorem 3.2.1 of [9]. Outside the vortex balls, we combine (2.1) with the strong convergence bound (2.2), and (2.3) follows directly.

5. The restriction on μ_0 allows us to use Theorem 3 of [19], and estimate (2.4) follows directly. To establish (2.5) we can follow the proof of Theorem 11 in [24], along with the equipartioning result of [23], which lets us localize the stress-energy tensor $\nabla w \otimes \nabla w$ up to an error of order $O(\sqrt{|\log\varepsilon|})$.

□

3. Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of the vortex motion law entails first establishing the smooth evolution of the vortex paths $\xi_j(t)$ via the compactness theorems in Section 2. The second step will compare the vortex paths with the ODE (1.11).

3.1. **Lipschitz Continuity of the Vortex Paths.**

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\{a_j^0, d_j\}$ be a configuration of vortices such that $d_j \in \{-1, 1\}$. Let $w_\varepsilon^0, 0 < \varepsilon < 1$ satisfy (1.4) under well-preparedness condition (1.15). There exist a time $T > 0$, a sequence $\varepsilon_k \to 0$, and $\xi_j \in Lip([0, T_0], \Omega)$ such that $\xi_j(0) = a_j^0$ and*

$$\sup_k \left\| J(w_{\varepsilon_k}(\cdot, t)) - \pi \sum d_k \delta_{\xi_k(t)} \right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega)} \to 0 \tag{3.1}$$

as $k \to \infty$ and $t \in [0, T_0]$.

Proof. 1. We first claim that there exists a T_ε such that $J(u_\varepsilon)$ is a continuous function on $[0, T_\varepsilon]$ into $L^1(\Omega)$. Since $J(u) = -\nabla^\perp \mathcal{R}u \cdot \nabla \mathcal{I}u$ then

$$\|J(u_\varepsilon(t)) - J(u_\varepsilon(s))\|_{W^{-1,1}} \leq C \|\nabla u(t) - \nabla u(s)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u(t) + \nabla u(s)\|_{L^2} \leq C_\varepsilon o_{|t-s|}(1),$$

since the solution map is a continuous function into $H^1(\Omega)$.

2. We use (1.8) along with the results in Proposition 2.1. Set

$$\varphi_j(x) = x\chi\left(\frac{|x-a_j^0|}{r_{a^0}}\right) \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$\chi(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } s \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{for } s > 2 \end{cases}.$$

Choosing $0 \leq s < r \leq$ and using (1.8) and (1.15) we generate the following bound,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_r^s \int_\Omega \varphi_j(x)\partial_t J(u(\cdot,t))dxdt\right| &\leq C\left\|\nabla^2\varphi_j\right\|_{L^\infty}\int_r^s\int_{\Omega_{r_a}(r)}|\nabla w_\varepsilon(t)|^2\,dx \\ &\quad + C\frac{\|\nabla\varphi_j\|_{L^\infty}}{|\log\varepsilon|}\int_r^s\int_\Omega e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon)dxds \\ &\leq C|s-r|,\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}\pi\left|\xi_j(s)-\xi_j(r)\right| &= \pi\left|\int\varphi_j(x)\left(\delta_{\xi_j(s)}-\delta_{\xi_j(r)}\right)dx\right| \\ &\leq C\left\|\nabla\varphi_j\right\|_{L^\infty}\sup_{t\in[r,s]}\left\|J(w_\varepsilon(\cdot,t))-\pi\sum d_j\delta_{\xi_j(t)}\right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}} \\ &\quad + \left|\int_r^s\int_\Omega\varphi_j(x)\partial_t J(w_\varepsilon(\cdot,t))dxdt\right| \\ &\overset{(2.4)}{\leq} C|s-r| + o_\varepsilon(1).\end{aligned}$$

We can now employ a diagonalization argument. Taking subsequence $\varepsilon_k \subset \varepsilon$, we generate a dense, countable collection of times $t \in [0,T]$, in which T depends solely on r_a, such that the $\xi_j(t)$ satisfy $\xi_j(0) = a_j^0$ with (3.1) as $k \to \infty$. Since the collection is dense, we can take the limit as $k \to \infty$. The Lipschitz extension of the $\xi_j(t)$'s on $[0,T]$ satisfy the same conditions. □

3.2. **Vortex Dynamics.** In this subsection we complete the proof of Theorem 1. We use the Lipschitz paths $\xi_j(t)$ generated along the subsequence ε_k from Proposition 3.1. We will examine the differences between vortex paths and the ODE, which will lead eventually to a Gronwall argument.

The proof requires two technical estimates. The first describes the gradient of $W(\alpha)$ in terms of the canonical harmonic map w_*.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\alpha \in \Omega$ then $w_* = w_*(\cdot,\alpha)$ and the renormalized energy $W(\alpha)$ satisfy*

$$\int \mathbb{J}_{k\ell}\partial_k\partial_m\varphi j(w_*(\cdot,\alpha))_m j(w_*(\cdot,\alpha))_\ell dx = -\sum d_j\mathbb{J}_{\ell k}\partial_k\varphi(\alpha_j)\left(\nabla_{\alpha_j}W(\alpha)\right)_\ell \tag{3.3}$$

where $\varphi \in C^2(\Omega)$ and $\nabla^2\varphi$ has support in a neighborhood of the α_j's.

Proof. See for example [9, 27] for a proof. □

The second technical result proves weak compactness of the supercurrent away from the vortex cores. This will be used to bound certain cross terms in the Gronwall argument. The argument is along the lines of similar proofs in [9, 27], among other places, and we sketch most of the argument.

Define the trajectory set

$$\Theta_{\xi(t)} = \{(\xi_j(t), t), t \in [0,T]\}$$

for the n vortex paths $\xi_j(t)$ from Proposition 3.1, we let

$$\Omega_{T,\xi} = \Omega \times [0,T] \backslash \Theta_{\xi(t)}$$

denote the complement, where we expect uniform bounds.

Lemma 3.3. *Let w_ε be a solution to* (1.4) *under hypotheses in Proposition 3.1 then there exists a subsequence ε_k such that*

$$\frac{j(w_{\varepsilon_k}(\cdot,\cdot))}{|w_{\varepsilon_k}|} \rightharpoonup j(w_*(\xi(t))) \tag{3.4}$$

weakly in $L^2(\Omega_{T,\xi})$ where $\xi(t) = (\xi_1(t), \dots, \xi_n(t))$ are the Lipschitz vortex paths generated in Proposition 3.1.

Proof. We first claim that there exists a subsequence such that $j(w_{\varepsilon_k}) \to j(w_*)$ in $(C_0^\infty(\Omega \times [0,T]))^*$. First we note that

$$\operatorname{curl} j(w_{\varepsilon_k}) - \operatorname{curl} j(w_*(\xi(t)) \rightharpoonup 0$$

in $L^\infty(W^{-1,1}(\Omega))$, and hence in distribution. On the other hand

$$\operatorname{div} j(w_{\varepsilon_k}) - \operatorname{div} j(w_*(\xi(t))) = -\frac{1}{\eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2}\nabla\eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2 \cdot j(w_{\varepsilon_k}) - \partial_t\left(\frac{1-|w_{\varepsilon_k}|^2}{2\eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2}\right) \rightharpoonup 0$$

in $L^\infty([0,T]; L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega_{T,\xi})) + H^{-1}([0,T]; L^2(\Omega_{T,\xi}))$, and hence in distribution, where we used that $|\nabla\eta_\varepsilon^2| = O(|\log\varepsilon|^{-1})$.

Choosing a suitable subsequence, which we again label ε_k, we see that $\|j(w_{\varepsilon_k})/|w_{\varepsilon_k}|\|_{L^2(\Theta_{T,\xi})}$ is uniformly bounded. From (2.3) $j(w_{\varepsilon_k})$ is uniformly bounded in $L^p([0,T]\times\Omega)$ for every $1 \le p < 2$. We can now generate a Hodge decomposition of $j(w_{\varepsilon_k})$ in $[0,T]\times\Omega$; in particular, since $j(w_{\varepsilon_k})\cdot\nu = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ then $j(w_{\varepsilon_k}) \rightharpoonup \nabla^\perp H$ in $L^p(\Omega_{T,\xi})$ for each $1 \le p < 2$ with H a harmonic function in $\Omega_{T,\xi}$. By a removable singularity argument, we can show that $H \equiv 0$, and $j(w_{\varepsilon_k}) \rightharpoonup j(w_*(\xi(t)))$ in $L^p(\Omega_{T,\xi})$, and due to the uniform bounds, the weak convergence extends to $L^2(\Omega_{T,\xi})$.

□

With Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 in hand, we can now turn to the proof of the main result.

Proof of Theorem 1. Define

$$\mu(t) \equiv \sum_j |\alpha_j(t) - \xi_j(t)| = \sum_j \mu_j(t).$$

We will estimate the difference between the vortex paths ξ_j, generated by (1.4), and the positions a_j, extracted by the ODE (1.11). We also let $D_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon(t), b(t)) = E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon(t)) - W_\varepsilon(b(t))$ denote the time-varying excess energy.

Recall from (1.11) that we will estimate the differences between vortex paths and the ODE positions:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi\dot{\alpha}_j &= -\nabla^\perp_{\alpha_j} W(\alpha) + \pi\nabla^\perp Q_0(\alpha_j)\\ &= -\nabla^\perp_{\xi_j} W(\xi) + \pi\nabla^\perp Q_0(\xi_j) + \nabla^\perp_{\xi_j} W(\xi) - \nabla^\perp_{\alpha_j} W(\alpha) + \pi\nabla^\perp Q_0(\alpha_j) - \pi\nabla^\perp Q_0(\xi_j). \qquad (3.5)\end{aligned}$$

Choosing a time interval $0 \le a < b \le T$ and using (1.8), (3.2), (3.3), (3.5),

$$\begin{aligned}\pi\left(\mu_j(b) - \mu_j(a)\right) \le{}& \int_a^b \left|\nabla_{\xi_j} W(\xi(t)) - \nabla_{\alpha_j} W(\alpha(t))\right| dt + \pi\int_a^b |\nabla Q_0(\xi_j(t)) - \nabla Q_0(\alpha_j(t))|\, dt\\ &+ \limsup_{k\to\infty}\left|\int_a^b \int_{B_r(\alpha_j)} \mathbb{J}_{\ell p}\partial_p\partial_q\varphi\left[(\partial_q w_{\varepsilon_k}, \partial_\ell w_{\varepsilon_k}) - (\partial_q w_*(\xi), \partial_\ell w_*(\xi))\right] dxdt\right|\\ &+ \limsup_{k\to\infty}\left|\int_a^b \left[\int_{B_r(\alpha_j)} \mathbb{J}_{\ell p}\partial_p\varphi\frac{\partial_q\eta^2_{\varepsilon_k}}{\eta^2_{\varepsilon_k}}\left(\partial_\ell w_{\varepsilon_k}, \partial_q w_{\varepsilon_k}\right) dx - \pi\nabla^\perp Q_0(\xi_j)\right] dt\right|\\ &+ \limsup_{k\to\infty}\left|\int_a^b \int_{B_r(\alpha_j)} \mathbb{J}_{\ell p}\partial_p\varphi\partial_\ell\eta^2_{\varepsilon_k}\frac{\left(1-|w_{\varepsilon_k}|^2\right)^2}{4\varepsilon^2} dxdt\right|\\ ={}& \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C} + \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{E}. \qquad (3.6)\end{aligned}$$

We can control $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ using our Lipschitz bounds; in particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_a^b |\nabla W(\xi_j(t)) - \nabla W(\alpha_j(t))| dt &\le \int_a^b \sup_{j:|\xi_j-\alpha_j|\le r_a/4} |\nabla^2 W(\alpha)| \left(\sum |\xi_j(t) - \alpha_j(t)|\right) dt\\ &\le C\int_a^b \mu(t) dt, \qquad (3.7)\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 10 of [19] to control the Hessian of $W(a)$, with a bound dependent on r_a. Likewise, we can use Section A on the regularity of η_{ε_k} to bound

$$\int_a^b |\nabla Q(\xi_j(t)) - \nabla Q(\alpha_j(t))| dt \le \|Q_0\|_{W^{2,\infty}} \int_a^b \mu(t) dt. \qquad (3.8)$$

We now turn to the control on $\mathcal{C}$. For shorthand we define components $j_k = (\frac{j(w_{\varepsilon_k})}{|w_{\varepsilon_k}|})_k$ and $j_k^* = (j(w_*(\xi)))_k$ of the supercurrents, and since $\partial_k w_{\varepsilon_k} = (\partial_k |w_{\varepsilon_k}| + ij_k)\frac{w_{\varepsilon_k}}{|w_{\varepsilon_k}|}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C} &\leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left| \int_a^b \int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)} \mathbb{J}_{\ell p} \partial_p \partial_q \varphi \partial_q |w_{\varepsilon_k}| \partial_\ell |w_{\varepsilon_k}| dx dt \right| \\
&\quad + \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left| \int_a^b \int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)} \mathbb{J}_{\ell p} \partial_p \partial_q \varphi \left(j_q - j_q^*, j_\ell - j_\ell^* \right) dx dt \right| \\
&\quad + \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left| \int_a^b \int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)} \mathbb{J}_{\ell p} \partial_p \partial_q \varphi \left(j_q^* \left(j_\ell - j_\ell^* \right) \right) dx dt \right| \\
&\quad + \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left| \int_a^b \int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)} \mathbb{J}_{\ell p} \partial_p \partial_q \varphi \left(\left(j_q - j_q^* \right) j_\ell^* \right) dx dt \right| \\
&= \mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 + \mathcal{C}_3 + \mathcal{C}_4
\end{aligned}$$

and since $D_{\varepsilon_k}(w_{\varepsilon_k}, \xi) = D_{\varepsilon_k}(w_{\varepsilon_k}, \alpha) + W(\xi) - W(\alpha) + \pi Q_0(\xi) - \pi Q_0(\alpha)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 &\overset{(2.1)}{\lesssim} \int_a^b D_{\varepsilon_k}(w_{\varepsilon_k}, \xi(t)) dt + o_k(1) \\
&\overset{(3.7),(3.8)}{\leq} C \int_a^b \mu(t) dt + o_k(1),
\end{aligned}$$

since $D_{\varepsilon_k}(w_{\varepsilon_k}(t), \alpha(t)) = D_{\varepsilon_k}(w_{\varepsilon_k}^0, \alpha^0) = o_k(1)$. From Lemma 3.3, we have that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathcal{C}_3 + \mathcal{C}_4 = 0$; note this is where we needed to consider the time-integral on (a, b).

Next we control $\mathcal{D}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D} &\leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left| \int_a^b \int_{B_r(a_j)} \mathbb{J}_{\ell p} \partial_p \varphi \frac{\partial_q \eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2}{\eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2} \left[(\partial_\ell w_{\varepsilon_k}, \partial_q w_{\varepsilon_k}) - \pi \left| \log \varepsilon_k \right| \delta_{\ell q} \sum \delta_{\xi_j(t)} \right] dx dt \right| \\
&\quad + \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left| \int_a^b \pi \left| \log \varepsilon_k \right| \frac{\nabla^\perp \eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2(\xi_j(t))}{\eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2(\xi_j(t))} - \pi \nabla^\perp Q_0(\xi_j(t)) dt \right| \\
&= \mathcal{D}_1 + \mathcal{D}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

We can now bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_1 &\leq T \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left[\left\| \nabla \left(\partial_p \varphi \frac{\partial_q \eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2}{\eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2} \right) \right\|_{L^\infty} \left\| (\partial_\ell w_{\varepsilon_k}, \partial_q w_{\varepsilon_k}) - \pi \left| \log \varepsilon_k \right| \delta_{\ell q} \sum \delta_{\xi_j} \right\|_{\dot{W}^{-1,1}} \right] \\
&\overset{(2.5)}{\lesssim} \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{C \left| \log \varepsilon_k \right|^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{r_\alpha^2} = o_k(1)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_2 \lesssim \limsup_{k\to\infty} \int_a^b \left| \frac{\partial_p Q_{\varepsilon_k}(\xi_j)}{\eta_{\varepsilon_k}^2} - \partial_p Q_0(\xi_j) \right| dt = o_k(1).$$

Finally, we bound $\mathcal{E}$ using (2.2):

$$\mathcal{E} \leq \frac{C}{r_a \left|\log \varepsilon_k\right|} \int_a^b \int_\Omega \frac{(1-|w_{\varepsilon_k}(t)|^2)^2}{\varepsilon_k^2} dxdt \leq \frac{CT}{r_a \left|\log \varepsilon_k\right|} = o_k(1).$$

Combining together estimates generates a differential inequality,

$$\mu(b) - \mu(a) \leq C \int_a^b \mu(t) dt,$$

and choosing $b = a + \delta$ and dividing by δ implies the classical Gronwall inequality with $\mu(0) = 0$. Therefore, $\mu(t) = 0$ for all $0 \leq t \leq T$. We can then restart the problem at time T and continue the dynamics until $r_a \to 0$.

So far we have only shown the theorem for a subsequence. However, our argument can be applied to subsequences of any sequence of $\varepsilon_k \to 0$, and as the limit is independent of the chosen subsequence, we obtain convergence for $\varepsilon \to 0$ without taking subsequences. □

4. Second order Gamma Convergence and Gradient Flow

In this section we collect and restate some of our results on the static energy in the spirit of Γ-convergence, compare [1] for the corresponding results for $p_\varepsilon \equiv 1$. For dynamics, we show that the approach of [33] can be adapted to treat the gradient flow as opposed to the Schrödinger dynamics studied in the previous sections.

All of our arguments work with either Neumann or Dirichlet boundary conditions, just as those in [1] and [33]. For simplicity, we assume Neumann boundary conditions throughout, and sometimes comment on changes necessary for the Dirichlet case.

4.1. Further Γ-convergence results.

We discuss Γ-convergence properties for $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}$. From this, an analysis for the original energy

$$E_\varepsilon(u) = \int_\Omega e_\varepsilon(u) dx = \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon^2}(p_\varepsilon^2 - |u|^2)^2 dx$$

can also be deduced by the Lassoued-Mironescu result [25]

$$E_\varepsilon(w\eta_\varepsilon) = E_\varepsilon(\eta_\varepsilon) + E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) \tag{4.1}$$

that follows from the calculation

$$e_\varepsilon(u) = e_\varepsilon(\eta_\varepsilon) + e_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w) + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{div}\left((|w|^2-1)\eta_\varepsilon \nabla \eta_\varepsilon\right).$$

If $|w| = |u| = \eta_\varepsilon = 1$ on $\partial\Omega$ or $\nu \cdot \nabla \eta_\varepsilon = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we can deduce (4.1) in the Dirichlet or Neumann case, respectively. However, $E_\varepsilon(\eta_\varepsilon)$ contributes very little to the energy, and all the dynamically interesting information is encoded in $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w)$, so we concentrate on $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}$ in the following.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $w_\varepsilon \in H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ be a sequence of functions with*

$$E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon) \le K_1|\log\varepsilon|.$$

Then the Jacobians $J(w_\varepsilon)$ are compact in $\dot{W}^{-1,1}(\Omega)$ and for a subsequence,

$$J(w_\varepsilon) \to J_* = \pi\sum d_i\delta_{a_i},$$

where $a_i \in \Omega$ are distinct points and $d_i \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\}$. Furthermore,

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon) \ge \pi\sum|d_i| = \|J_*\|_{\mathcal{M}}$$

with $\|J_*\|_{\mathcal{M}} \le K_1$.

Proof. Comparing with the standard Ginzburg-Landau energy E_ε^1, we clearly have

$$\min_{\overline{\Omega}}\min(\eta_\varepsilon^2,\eta_\varepsilon^4)E_\varepsilon^1(w_\varepsilon) \le E^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon) \le \max_{\overline{\Omega}}\max(\eta_\varepsilon^2,\eta_\varepsilon^4)E_\varepsilon^1(w_\varepsilon). \tag{4.2}$$

As both the minimum and the maximum can be estimated as $1+O(\frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|})$, we obtain that

$$E_\varepsilon^1(w_\varepsilon) \le K_1|\log\varepsilon| + CK_1.$$

We are now in a position to apply arguments for the standard Ginzburg-Landau functional from [18, 35] to obtain the compactness of $J(w_\varepsilon)$.

The lower bound for the energy follows from the standard Ginzburg-Landau lower bounds and (4.2). □

The following bound is the heart of the second order Γ-convergence argument.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $B_{r_0}(a) \subset \Omega$. If $J(w_\varepsilon) \to \pm\pi\delta_\alpha$ in $W^{-1,1}(B_{r_0}(\alpha))$ then*

$$\liminf_{r\to 0}\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon;B_r(\alpha)) - \pi\log\frac{r}{\varepsilon} \ge \gamma_0 + \pi Q_0(\alpha),$$

where γ_0 is the constant introduced in [4, Lemma IX.1].

Proof. We have shown this in Step 4 of the proof of Proposition 2.1. □

Proposition 4.3. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.1, if we have for some $K_2 > 0$ the sharper upper bound*

$$E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon) \le \|J_*\|_{\mathcal{M}}|\log\varepsilon| + K_2,$$

then $J_* = \pi\sum_{i=1}^n d_i\delta_{\alpha_i}$ with distinct α_i and $d_i \in \{\pm 1\}$.

Furthermore, (w_ε) are then bounded in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $p \in [1,2)$ and satisfy the energy lower bound

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\left(E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon) - \pi n|\log\varepsilon|\right) \ge n\gamma_0 + W(\alpha_i,d_i) + \pi\sum_{i=1}^n Q_0(\alpha_i),$$

where W is the renormalized energy defined in (1.10).

Also, there is K_3 such that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_\Omega (1-|w_\varepsilon|^2)^2\,dx\le K_3.$$

Proof. We clearly have $E^1_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon)\le \|J_*\||\log\varepsilon|+K_4$ with K_4 depending on K_2 and $\|J_*\|$ as well as on Q_0. Hence we can use Ginzburg-Landau arguments of Colliander-Jerrard [9] or Alicandro-Ponsiglione [1] to obtain the claimed structure of J_*. The L^p bound follows using an argument of Struwe [39]. Let now $r>0$ be so small that $B_r(a_i)$ are disjoint and do not intersect $\partial\Omega$. Then we apply Proposition 4.2 to obtain

$$\liminf_{r\to 0}\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} E^{\eta_\varepsilon}_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon;\bigcup B_r(\alpha_i))-\pi n\log\frac{r}{\varepsilon}-n\gamma_0-\pi\sum Q_0(\alpha_i)\ge 0.$$

In $\Omega_r(\alpha)$, we use that w_* is the optimal S^1 valued map in its class, and let $\hat{w}_*$ be the subsequential weak limit of w_ε. Then $|\hat{w}_*|=1$ a.e. and hence by lower semicontinuity of the Dirichlet integral,

$$\int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)}|\nabla w_*|^2dx\le\int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)}|\nabla\hat{w}_*|^2dx\le\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)}|\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2dx\le C(r).$$

By (4.2), we deduce that also

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}E^{\eta_\varepsilon}_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon;\Omega_r(\alpha))\ge\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)}|\nabla w_*|^2dx.$$

Using that

$$W(\alpha,d)=\lim_{r\to 0}\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_r(\alpha)}|\nabla w_*|^2dx-\pi n\log\frac{1}{r}\right),$$

we obtain the claimed lower bound.

The upper bound for the penalty term has been shown in Proposition 2.1. □

4.2. **The gradient flow.** Now we study the gradient flow analog of (1.1),

$$\frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\partial_t u=\Delta u+(p^2(x)-|u|^2)u. \tag{4.3}$$

Instead of deriving an equation of motion by studying the limits of the energy density, we are going to use the method of Γ-convergence of gradient flows. This has the advantage that we will require slightly less regularity and convergence properties for the potential term $p(x)$ than in the Schrödinger part of this article.

Again, we use the approach of dividing by the profile η_ε, leading to an equation for $w_\varepsilon=\frac{u_\varepsilon}{\eta_\varepsilon}$. As we assume Neumann boundary conditions $\partial_\nu\eta_\varepsilon=0$ for η_ε, then Neumann boundary conditions $\partial_\nu u=0$ imply Neumann boundary conditions $\partial_\nu w_\varepsilon=0$. As before, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\eta_\varepsilon^2\partial_t w_\varepsilon=\operatorname{div}(\eta_\varepsilon^2\nabla w_\varepsilon)+\frac{\eta_\varepsilon^4}{\varepsilon^2}(1-|w_\varepsilon|^2)w_\varepsilon. \tag{4.4}$$

This is the gradient flow of $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}$ with respect to the scalar product on $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ given by the quadratic form

$$\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon}^2 = \frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2|v|^2dx.$$

In fact, we have for $\phi \in C^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{C})$ the Gâteaux derivative

$$\mathrm{d}E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon;\phi) = \int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2\nabla w_\varepsilon\cdot\nabla\phi - \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^4}{\varepsilon^2}(1-|w_\varepsilon|^2)w_\varepsilon\cdot\phi dx$$

and on the other hand,

$$\langle\partial_t w_\varepsilon,\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2\partial_t w_\varepsilon\phi dx$$

so integrating by parts we see that (4.4) is a gradient flow, more precisely $\partial_t w_\varepsilon = -\nabla_{\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon}E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w)$.

We will show that we can relate this gradient flow to that of $F(\alpha)$, where for $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n)\in\Omega^n$, $\alpha_i\neq\alpha_j$ for $i\neq j$, we set

$$F(\alpha) = W(\alpha,d) + \pi\sum_{j=1}^n Q_0(\alpha_j)$$

and we will use the following metric on $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ (the tangential space to Ω^n):

$$\|b\|_{\mathcal{Y}}^2 = \pi\sum_{j=1}^n |b_j|^2.$$

We will now follow closely the approach in [33] to obtain the convergence of the gradient flow of $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}$ to that of F. In fact, the proof goes through with no essential changes, and we will therefore assume the reader is familiar with the argument of [33] and mostly highlight the differences.

Theorem 3. *Assume that the profiles η_ε solving (1.3) satisfy $Q_\varepsilon = |\log\varepsilon|(\eta_\varepsilon^2-1)\to Q_0$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$.*

Let (w_ε) be a family of solutions of (4.4) with Neumann boundary conditions $\partial_\nu w_\varepsilon = 0$ and initial data w_ε^0. Assume that w_ε^0 satisfy $J(w_\varepsilon^0)\to\pi\sum d_j\delta_{a_j^0}$ in $\dot{W}^{-1,1}$ with $d_j\in\{\pm1\}$.

Let $a(t):[0,T^m)\to\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ be a solution of the system of ODEs

$$\pi\dot{\alpha}_j(t) = -\nabla_{\alpha_j}W(\alpha(t),d) - \pi\nabla Q_0(\alpha_j(t)) \tag{4.5}$$

where $T^m = T(a^0)\in(0,\infty]$ is the maximal time of existence for (4.5), i.e. the smallest time T such that as as $t\to T$, we have $r_{\alpha(t)}\to 0$.

If the initial data are very well-prepared, i.e. $D_\varepsilon(0) = E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon^0) - H_\varepsilon(\alpha^0)\to 0$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$, then for $0\le t<T_m$, $J(w_\varepsilon(t))\to\pi\sum d_j\delta_{\alpha_j(t)}$ so we have convergence of the gradient flow of $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}$ to that of F. Furthermore, $D_\varepsilon(t) = E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon(t)) - H_\varepsilon(\alpha(t))\to 0$ so the data continue

to be well-prepared. Finally, we have for $T < T^m$ and any $B_i(t)$ that are disjoint open balls contained in Ω and centered at $\alpha_i(t)$ that

$$\frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\int_0^T\int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2 \left|\partial_t w_\varepsilon - \chi_{B_i(t)}\dot\alpha_i(t)\cdot\nabla w_\varepsilon\right|^2 dxdt \to 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Remark 4.1. See Proposition 1.2 for conditions on the potential p_ε that imply the convergence of Q_ε assumed in the theorem. Note that we require less regularity and convergence than for the Schrödinger case.

Proof of Theorem 3. The proof is mostly an exercise in changing E_ε^1 to $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}$ in the corresponding results in [33]. The main observation, which we will use repeatedly below, is that for any sequence of $f_\varepsilon \in L^2(\Omega)$ we have

$$(1+\frac{C}{|\log\varepsilon|})^{-1}\int_\Omega |f_\varepsilon|^2dx \le \int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2|f_\varepsilon|^2dx \le (1+\frac{C}{|\log\varepsilon|})\int_\Omega |f_\varepsilon|^2dx, \tag{4.7}$$

so in particular if $\int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2|f_\varepsilon|^2dx \le K|\log\varepsilon|$, then $\int_\Omega |f_\varepsilon|^2dx \le K|\log\varepsilon| + KC$, and a similar reverse inequality.

We note that any solution of (4.4) satisfies for $t_1 < t_2$

$$E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon(t_2)) = E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon(t_1)) + \frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2|\partial_t w_\varepsilon|^2dxdt$$

as follows from multiplying (4.4) with $\partial_t w_\varepsilon$ and integrating by parts. In particular, $s \mapsto E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon(s))$ is weakly decreasing and

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2|\partial_t w_\varepsilon|^2dxdt \le C|\log\varepsilon|^2.$$

Essentially verbatim as in [33, Lemma 3.4], we can show the existence of $T_0 > 0$ such that actually

$$\int_0^{T_0}\int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2|\partial_t w_\varepsilon|^2dxdt \le C|\log\varepsilon|,$$

which implies

$$\int_0^{T_0}\int_\Omega |\partial_t w_\varepsilon|^2dxdt \le C|\log\varepsilon| + o(|\log\varepsilon|).$$

In addition, we also have for all $t \in [0, T_0)$ with $n = \sum |d_j^0|$ the estimate $E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon(t)) \le \pi n|\log\varepsilon| + C$ and so $E_\varepsilon^1(w_\varepsilon(t)) \le \pi n|\log\varepsilon| + o(|\log\varepsilon|)$.

We can now apply Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.3 of [33] to w_ε and obtain that (for a subsequence) $J(w_\varepsilon(t)) \to \pi\sum d_j\delta_{b_j(t))}$, where $b_j \in H^1(0,T_0;\mathbf{R}^2)$ with $b_j(0) = \alpha_j^0$, i.e. the d_j are constant. Corollary 7 of [34] now applies to show

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega |\partial_t w_\varepsilon|^2dxdt \ge \pi\sum\int_{t_1}^{t_2}|\dot b_i|^2dt.$$

As $|\eta_\varepsilon^2 - 1| \leq \frac{C}{|\log \varepsilon|}$, this also implies

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega \eta_\varepsilon^2 |\partial_t w_\varepsilon|^2 dxdt \geq \pi \sum \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\dot b_i|^2 dt. \tag{4.8}$$

The last equation is the lower bound part needed for the Γ-convergence of gradient flows argument.

The construction also proceeds almost verbatim as in Proposition 3.5 of [33]. Let w_ε satisfy $J(w_\varepsilon) \to \pi \sum d_j \delta_{\alpha_j}$ and $D_\varepsilon(w_\varepsilon, \alpha) \leq C$ and assume that $\|\nabla_{\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon} E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(w_\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon} \leq C$. This implies that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{1}{\eta_\varepsilon^2}\left|\operatorname{div}(\eta_\varepsilon^2 \nabla w_\varepsilon) + \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^4}{\varepsilon^2}(1-|w_\varepsilon|^2)w_\varepsilon\right|^2 dx \leq \frac{C}{|\log\varepsilon|}.$$

We set

$$f_\varepsilon = \operatorname{div}(\eta_\varepsilon^2 \nabla w_\varepsilon) + \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^4}{\varepsilon^2}(1-|w_\varepsilon|^2)w_\varepsilon$$

and note that $f_\varepsilon \to 0$ in L^2 and $(iw_\varepsilon, f_\varepsilon) = (iw_\varepsilon, \operatorname{div}(\eta_\varepsilon^2 \nabla w_\varepsilon))$. Furthermore

$$\operatorname{div} j(w_\varepsilon) = (iw_\varepsilon, \operatorname{div}\nabla w_\varepsilon) = (iw_\varepsilon, \operatorname{div}(\eta_\varepsilon^2\nabla w_\varepsilon)) - \nabla(\eta_\varepsilon^2)\cdot j(w_\varepsilon).$$

By (2.2) we see $|w_\varepsilon| \to 1$. From (2.3) together with $|\nabla(\eta_\varepsilon^2)| \to 0$ we deduce $\operatorname{div} j(w_\varepsilon) \to 0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. From this point we can continue as in [33], as now both $\operatorname{curl} j(w_\varepsilon)$ and $\operatorname{div} j(w_\varepsilon)$ have the same properties as the analogous quantities in [33].

Now let $V \in (\mathbf{R}^2)^n$ and let $b(t)$ a curve satisfying $b(0) = a$ and $\partial_t b(0) = V$. We claim that there exists a path $v_\varepsilon(t)$ with $v_\varepsilon(0) = w_\varepsilon$ and the following properties:

$$\|\partial_t v_\varepsilon(0)\|_{\mathcal{X}_\varepsilon}^2 = \|\partial_t b(0)\|_{\mathcal{Y}}^2 + o(1), \tag{4.9}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(v_\varepsilon(t)) = \frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} F(b(t)) + g(a) D_\varepsilon \tag{4.10}$$

for some function g that is locally bounded in $\{a \in \Omega^n : r_a > 0\}$.

To construct this path in function space, we use the same pushing as in [33]. Let $B_i = B_\rho(a_i)$ with $\rho < r_a$ be pairwise disjoint balls and define $\chi_t : \Omega \to \Omega$ to be a one-parameter family of diffeomorphisms that satisfies

$$\chi_t(x) = x + tV_i \quad \text{in } B_i.$$

With the phase corrector function ψ_t defined as in (3.24) of [33], set

$$v_\varepsilon(\chi_t(x), t) = w_\varepsilon(x) e^{i\psi_t(x)}.$$

The claim (4.9) follows as in [33], keeping in mind our observation (4.7).

To calculate the energy change along this path, we change variables $y = \chi_t(x)$ and obtain with $\mathrm{Jac}(\chi_t)$ denoting the Jacobian determinant,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon}(v_\varepsilon) &= \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}\eta_\varepsilon^2(y)|\nabla v_\varepsilon(y)|^2 + \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^4(y)}{4\varepsilon^2}(1-|v_\varepsilon(y)|^2)^2 dy \\ &= \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\eta_\varepsilon \circ \chi_t(x)\right)^2 \left| D\chi_t^{-1} \nabla (w_\varepsilon e^{i\psi_t}) \right|^2 + \frac{(\eta_\varepsilon \circ \chi_t)^4}{4\varepsilon^2}(1-|w_\varepsilon(x)|^2)^2 |\mathrm{Jac}(\chi_t)| \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

We now differentiate in time and set $t = 0$. When the derivative does not hit $\eta_\varepsilon \circ \chi_t$, the resulting terms can be dealt with exactly as in [33] by our observation (4.7). The remaining terms are

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} (\eta_\varepsilon \circ \chi_t)^2 |\nabla w_\varepsilon|^2 dx$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} (\eta_\varepsilon \circ \chi_t)^4 (1-|w_\varepsilon|^2)^2 dx.$$

We note that in B_i, $\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0}(\eta_\varepsilon \circ \chi_t)^2 = V_i \cdot \nabla(\eta_\varepsilon^2)$. Using the uniform convergence $\frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\nabla(\eta_\varepsilon^2) \to \nabla Q_0$ and the fact that the logarithmic part of the energy is concentrated in the B_i (recall Proposition 2.1 or (3.17) of [33]), we deduce that $\mathcal{A}_1 \to \pi \sum V_i \cdot \nabla Q_0(\alpha_i)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. To show that $\mathcal{A}_2 \to 0$, we recall (2.2) and note that $|\nabla(\eta_\varepsilon^4)| \to 0$ uniformly in Ω. Together with the results of [33] for the terms not involving derivatives of η_ε, we deduce (4.10).

On the interval $[0, T_0)$, we can now apply Theorem 1.4 of [33] and obtain the claim of Theorem 3 up to the time T_0. The global statement up to T^m follows as in Section 3.3 of [33]. □

5. Numerical Simulations of the Vortex Dynamics

Armed with the dynamical equation (1.11), we can simulate the flow of vortices and observe the impact of the background potential at the scales we have studied in Theorem 1 assuming that G is well approximated by the Green's function on $\mathbf{R}^2$. For Ω a large ball for instance, the Green's function is locally well-approximated by the one for $\mathbf{R}^2$, see Remark 1.1. We will focus here on the case of the dipole (a pair of vortices of opposite charge) interacting with potentials of the form

$$V_1 = e^{-|\vec{x}|^2} \quad \text{Single Gaussian Well,} \tag{5.1}$$

$$V_2 = .225\tanh(x) \quad \text{Step Function to different material background,} \tag{5.2}$$

$$V_3 = e^{-|\vec{x}-(1,0)|^2} + e^{-|\vec{x}+(1,0)|^2} \quad \text{Double Gaussian Well,} \tag{5.3}$$

$$V_4 = \sum_{j,k=-15}^{15} e^{-|\vec{x}-(j,k)|^2} \quad \text{Lattice of Gaussian Wells.} \tag{5.4}$$

Recall that in the absence of the background potential, dipole dynamics simply move in in a straight line perpendicular to that connecting the vortex centers at a speed correlated to the vortex spacing.

The equations (1.11) for each choice of background are then plugged into the *ode15s* ODE solver in *Matlab* and integrated over time scales long enough to observe the impact of the background potential on the dipole dynamics. The results are recorded graphically in Figure 1.



FIGURE 1. Dipole dynamics for $d_1 = 1$, $d_2 = -1$ plotted over contours of Q_0 for the cases of 1. The single Gaussian (5.1) with $\vec{\alpha}_1(0) = (-5.0, 2.0)$, $\vec{\alpha}_2(0) = (-4.99, 1.99)$ (Top Left), 2. A smooth transition function (5.2) with $\vec{\alpha}_1(0) = (-5.0, -2.0)$, $\vec{a}_2(0) = (-4.99, -1.99)$ (Top Right), 3. A symmetric double-well Gaussian potential (5.3) with $\vec{\alpha}_1(0) = (-0.01, 1.0)$, $\vec{\alpha}_2(0) = (0.01, 1.0)$ (Bottom Left), 4. A square lattice array of Gaussians (5.4) with $\vec{\alpha}_1(0) = (-5.0, -1.99)$, $\vec{\alpha}_2(0) = (-4.99, -2.0)$.

APPENDIX A. ESTIMATES ON η_ε

We provide here the details required to prove Proposition 1.2. We seek to understand bounds on the function η_ε defined by

$$\Delta\eta_\varepsilon = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}(p_\varepsilon^2 - \eta_\varepsilon^2)\eta_\varepsilon, \tag{A.1}$$

with Neumann boundary conditions, where p_ε represents the IGL background on a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^2$.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. 1. We first claim there exists an H^{k+2} solution for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We use a slightly different ansatz for p_ε and η_ε:

$$p_\varepsilon = 1 + \frac{\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon}{|\log \varepsilon|}, \quad \eta_\varepsilon = 1 + \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon}{|\log \varepsilon|}.$$

Recall that we will assume that $p_\varepsilon \in H^k$ for $k \geq 2$ with $\varepsilon^2 \tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon \to 0$ in H^{k+1} as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and ∇p_0 is compactly supported strictly on the interior of Ω. The last assumption in particular will be used for simplicity to allow convergence up the boundary, though this likely can be relaxed. We first claim that η_ε is the unique real valued solution of the following minimization problem,

$$\eta_\varepsilon = \arg \min_{\eta \in H^1(\Omega;\mathbf{R}^1)} \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \eta|^2 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon^2} \left(p_\varepsilon^2 - \eta^2\right)^2 dx. \tag{A.2}$$

Since we are working on Ω a compact set, such a nontrivial η_ε exists for H^1 for ε sufficiently small and p_ε sufficiently bounded in H^1 using a direct method and Rellich-Kondrachov. We can improve the regularity away from the boundary. In particular if $\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon \in H^k$ then $\eta_\varepsilon \in H^{k+2}$, even though the H^{k+2} norm blows up as $\varepsilon \to 0$. This follows from standard elliptic theory results involving nonlinear Sobolev embeddings to bootstrap regularity, see for instance [8], Section 2.4. The existence of Euler-Lagrange equations, strong solutions, and classical solutions follow. Finally, uniqueness of the minimizer η_ε for $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ can be shown directly due to the form of the p_ε's.

As noted in (1.19) this is a slight shift of notation, as the Q_0 defined in the draft is not quite the limit of this family of functions, rather it takes the form

$$Q_0 = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left[2\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon + \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon^2}{|\log \varepsilon|} \right].$$

The Euler-Lagrange perturbation equation is written as

$$0 = \varepsilon^2 \Delta \widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon + |\log \varepsilon| (1 + \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon}{|\log \varepsilon|})(\frac{2\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon}{|\log \varepsilon|} + \frac{\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon^2}{|\log \varepsilon|^2} - \frac{2\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon}{|\log \varepsilon|} - \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon^2}{|\log \varepsilon|^2}), \tag{A.3}$$

and so

$$-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Delta \widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon = (\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon) \left[\left(1 + \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon}{|\log \varepsilon|} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon}{2|\log \varepsilon|} + \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon}{2|\log \varepsilon|} \right) \right].$$

Then we can write this as

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{|\log \varepsilon|} \left(\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon + \frac{\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon^2}{2|\log \varepsilon|} \right) - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \Delta \right) \widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon = \tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon + \frac{\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon^2}{2|\log \varepsilon|} - \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon^2}{2|\log \varepsilon|} + \frac{\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon^3}{|\log \varepsilon|^2}. \tag{A.4}$$

2. We next we establish ε-dependent estimates on a model problem.

The required estimates follow by, for instance, carefully modifying [13][Theorem 7.32], which draws upon ideas originally put forth by Nirenberg [30]. The proof relies upon an analysis of regularity up to the boundary by flattening locally to the half-plane and using the Green's function there, application of difference operators to gain regularity and induction on regularity estimates for elliptic problems with Neumann boundary problems. Essentially, the argument boils down to the fact that the operator is coercive for each ε however. The equation also has a unique set of solutions by the same property.[4]

To establish the bounds we need more precisely, we follow [13][Theorems 7.32 and 7.29], where the author studies Sobolev estimates on coercive elliptic equations. In our setting, these equations take the form

$$L_\varepsilon w := \left(1 + \frac{1}{|\log \varepsilon|} A - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\Delta\right) w = f, \quad \partial_\nu w = 0$$

on Ω, smooth enough. We will first prove that on half-balls of radius s with flat boundary, say $N(s)$ where y parametrizes the boundary and x parametrizes the interior. We claim we have an estimate of the form

$$\varepsilon^2 \|w\|_{H^{k+2}} + \|w\|_{H^k} \leq C \|f\|_{H^k}. \tag{A.5}$$

To see this, we first claim that

$$\varepsilon^2 \|\partial_x^\gamma w\|_{H^1(N(\tilde{r}))} \leq \|f\|_{H^k(N(r))} \tag{A.6}$$

with $\tilde{r} < r$, with $\gamma \leq k+1$. For $\gamma = 0$, this is exactly the coercivity estimate. Otherwise, we use an inductive argument constructed via difference operators inside the Dirichlet form $D(\Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w, \Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w)$ for ζ a cut-off to N that vanishes on the curved part of the boundary of N. Commuting with the cut-off function and integrating by parts when necessary, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^2 \|\Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w\|_{H^1(N(\tilde{r}))} + \left(1 - \frac{\max|A|}{|\log\varepsilon|}\right) \|\Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w\|_{L^2(N(\tilde{r}))} &\leq D(\Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w, \Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^2 \|\Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w\|_{H^1(N(\tilde{r}))} \left(\|f\|_{H^k(N(r))} + \|\partial^{\gamma-1} w\|_{L^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

[4]Perhaps the closest argument of this type for Neumann boundary conditions can be found in [40], Chapter 5.7, Propositions 7.4 and 7.5 where it states that for a smooth enough domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, there exists a unique solution v to the elliptic equation

$$(-\Delta + 1)v = f \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

and for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, given $f \in H^k$, we have

$$\|v\|^2_{H^{k+2}(\Omega)} \leq C\|\Delta v\|^2_{H^k(\Omega)} + C\|v\|^2_{H^{k+1}(\Omega)}.$$

Since we need precise control on the constants of our estimate with respect to ε for a perturbation of this equation, which are not available by rescaling, we have included a proof for completeness.

where then by induction we have

$$\varepsilon^2\|\Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w\|_{H^1(N(\tilde{r}))} + \left(1 - \frac{\max|A|}{|\log\varepsilon|}\right)\|\Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w\|_{L^2(N(\tilde{r}))} \leq D(\Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w, \Delta_h^\gamma \zeta w) \leq C\|f\|_{H^k(N(r))}.$$

Similarly, we claim that

$$\|\partial_x^\gamma w\|_{L^2(N(\tilde{r}))} \leq \|f\|_{H^k(N(r))} \tag{A.7}$$

for $0 \leq \gamma < k$. This follows by instead putting all the derivatives onto f and using L^2 instead of H^1 norms for the f term on the right hand side.

At the boundary, we can then establish (A.5), again proven using induction. To see this, we recognize that if γ is a multi-index and $\gamma_2 = 0$ or 1, then the estimate follows by (A.6) and (A.7). For use the fact that

$$\partial_y^2 w = -\frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}\left(f + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\partial_x^2 w - w\right).$$

If the number of derivatives on y is 0 or 1, we use the above estimate. For more than that, we pull off the first two derivatives in y, make the substitution, then use the inductive hypothesis.

Then, once such estimates are established on half-balls, we can create a sequence of cut-off functions $U_0 = B(0,R), \ldots, U_k = V_0$, $\overline{U}_{j+1} \subset U_j$, where $V_0 \cup V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_M = B(0,R)$ and V_j can be mapped to a half-ball for $j > 0$ and W_0 is an interior region.

Letting ζ_j be a cut-off to U_j, on the interior we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon^2\|w\|_{H^{j+2}(U_{j+1})} + \left(1 - \frac{\max|A|}{|\log\varepsilon|}\right)\|w\|_{H^j(U_{j+1})} &\leq \varepsilon^2\|\zeta_j w\|_{H^{j+2}(U_{j+1})} + \|\zeta_j w\|_{H^j(U_{j+1})} \\ &\leq C\|L\zeta_j w\|_{H^j} \\ &\leq C\|\zeta_j f\|_{H^j} + \varepsilon^2\|w\|_{H^{j+1}(U_j)},\end{aligned}$$

from which the result follows via induction. On regions identified with a half-ball, we apply (A.5).

3. We can use the linear estimates (A.5) to generate *a posteriori* estimates on the sequence. From the energetic formulation, we have using that $\eta = p_\varepsilon$ provides a natural set of bounds the observation

$$\|p_\varepsilon^2 - \eta_\varepsilon^2\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2\varepsilon^2\|\nabla p_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2.$$

This gives

$$\|\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq \sqrt{2}\varepsilon\|\nabla\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}$$

or

$$\|\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1}.$$

By a similar line of reasoning, we know that

$$\|\nabla \widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq \|\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1},$$

and hence

$$\|\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1} \leq C\|\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon\|_{H^1}.$$

We observe directly from (A.4) that

$$\|\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon\|_{H^k} \leq C\left(\|\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon + \frac{\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon^2}{2|\log\varepsilon|}\|_{H^k} + \frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|}\|\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon\|_{H^k}^2 + \frac{1}{|\log\varepsilon|^2}\|\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon\|_{H^k}^3\right),$$

which gives a uniform control on $\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon$ in H^k via a boot-strapping argument. Similarly, we can re-arrange (A.4) to observe

$$\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\Delta\right)\left(\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon\right) = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\Delta\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon + \frac{(\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon - \widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon)}{|\log\varepsilon|}\mathcal{P}(\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon, \tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon) \tag{A.8}$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}(\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon, \tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon) := \frac{\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{3\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\left(\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon(\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon + \widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon)\right)}{2|\log\varepsilon|}. \tag{A.9}$$

Hence, applying the linear estimates, we easily observe

$$\|\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon - \tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon\|_{H^{k-1}} \leq C\varepsilon^2\|\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon\|_{H^{k+1}},$$

which converges to 0 as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for $\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon$ sufficiently regular. Note, we have used here that $\nabla\rho_\varepsilon$ has compact support in order to integrate by parts. To remove this condition otherwise would require further work controlling the error terms relating to boundary condition of ρ_ε and potentially restrict us to local convergence estimates.

4. To finish the *a posteriori* convergence, we need to get to H^k convergence. Recall the equation

$$(1 - \varepsilon^2\Delta)q = g \qquad \partial_\nu q = 0,$$

which we rewrite as

$$(q - g) - \varepsilon^2\Delta q = 0 \qquad \partial_\nu q = 0. \tag{A.10}$$

We will replace q with $\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon$ and g by the right hand side of our elliptic equation.

For higher regularity, we have the formal calculation,

$$\begin{aligned}\int \left|\partial^k(q-g)\right|^2 dx &= \varepsilon^2 \int \partial^k(q-g)\partial^k\Delta q dx \\ &= -\varepsilon^2 \int \left|\nabla\partial^k q\right|^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\left\|\partial^k q\right\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\left\|\partial^k g\right\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 \int_{\partial\Omega} \partial_\nu\partial^k q\left(\partial^k q - \partial^k g\right) ds,\end{aligned}$$

where the boundary terms can be controlled by careful use of the Neumann boundary condition and the equations.

To establish the result rigorously up to the boundary, we must repeat the argument as in Step 2, but acting Δ_h^γ on both sides of (A.10) and then multiplying both sides by $\Delta_h^\gamma(q-g)$ and integrating. Specifically, we can consider the coercive Dirichlet form

$$D(\Delta_h^k\zeta(q-g),\Delta_h^k\zeta(q-g))+\varepsilon^2 D(\nabla_h\Delta_h^k\zeta q,\nabla_h\Delta_h^k\zeta q)$$

both in neighborhoods of the boundary, as well as in the interior to get elliptic estimates as in Step 2. □

References

[1] R. Alicandro and M. Ponsiglione. Ginzburg-Landau functionals and renormalized energy: a revised Γ-convergence approach. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 266(8):4890–4907, 2014.

[2] F. Arecchi. Space-time complexity in nonlinear optics. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 51(1–3):450 – 464, 1991.

[3] F. Arecchi, G. Giacomelli, P. Ramazza, and S. Residori. Vortices and defect statistics in two-dimensional optical chaos. *Physical review letters*, 67(27):3749, 1991.

[4] F. Bethuel, H. Brezis, and F. Hélein. *Ginzburg-Landau vortices*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 13. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1994.

[5] F. Bethuel, R. L. Jerrard, and D. Smets. On the NLS dynamics for infinite energy vortex configurations on the plane. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 24(2):671–702, 2008.

[6] H. Brezis, J.-M. Coron, and E. H. Lieb. Harmonic maps with defects. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 107(4):649–705, 1986.

[7] H. Brézis and T. Gallouet. Nonlinear Schrödinger evolution equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 4(4):677–681, 1980.

[8] H. Christianson, J. Marzuola, J. Metcalfe, and M. Taylor. Nonlinear bound states on weakly homogeneous spaces. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 39(1):34–97, 2014.

[9] J. E. Colliander and R. L. Jerrard. Vortex dynamics for the Ginzburg-Landau-Schrödinger equation. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (7):333–358, 1998.

[10] M. Dos Santos. The Ginzburg-Landau functional with a discontinuous and rapidly oscillating pinning term. Part II: the non-zero degree case. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 62(2):551–641, 2013.

[11] A. L. Fetter. Vortices in an imperfect Bose gas. IV. Translational velocity. *Phys. Rev.*, 151:100–104, Nov 1966.

[12] A. L. Fetter and A. A. Svidzinsky. Vortices in a trapped dilute Bose-Einstein condensate. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 13(12):R135, 2001.

[13] G. B. Folland. *Introduction to partial differential equations*. Princeton University Press, 1995.

[14] L. Gil, K. Emilsson, and G.-L. Oppo. Dynamics of spiral waves in a spatially inhomogeneous Hopf bifurcation. *Physical Review A*, 45(2):R567, 1992.

[15] R. Jerrard and D. Smets. Vortex dynamics for the two dimensional non homogeneous gross-pitaevskii equation. *Annali Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa*, 14(3):729–766, 2002.

[16] R. Jerrard and D. Spirn. Refined Jacobian estimates for Ginzburg-Landau functionals. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 56(1):135–186, 2007.

[17] R. L. Jerrard and H. M. Soner. Dynamics of Ginzburg-Landau vortices. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 142(2):99–125, 1998.

[18] R. L. Jerrard and H. M. Soner. The Jacobian and the Ginzburg-Landau energy. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 14(2):151–191, 2002.

[19] R. L. Jerrard and D. Spirn. Refined Jacobian estimates and Gross-Pitaevsky vortex dynamics. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 190(3):425–475, 2008.
[20] R. L. Jerrard and D. Spirn. Hydrodynamic limit of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 40(2):135–190, 2015.
[21] H.-Y. Jian and B.-H. Song. Vortex dynamics of Ginzburg-Landau equations in inhomogeneous superconductors. *J. Differential Equations*, 170(1):123–141, 2001.
[22] M. Kurzke, C. Melcher, R. Moser, and D. Spirn. Dynamics for Ginzburg-Landau vortices under a mixed flow. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 58(6):2597–2621, 2009.
[23] M. Kurzke and D. Spirn. Quantitative equipartition of the Ginzburg-Landau energy with applications. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 59(6):2077–2092, 2010.
[24] M. Kurzke and D. Spirn. Vortex liquids and the Ginzburg–Landau equation. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 2:e11 (63 pages), 2014.
[25] L. Lassoued and P. Mironescu. Ginzburg-Landau type energy with discontinuous constraint. *J. Anal. Math.*, 77:1–26, 1999.
[26] F. H. Lin. Some dynamical properties of Ginzburg-Landau vortices. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 49(4):323–359, 1996.
[27] F.-H. Lin and J. X. Xin. On the incompressible fluid limit and the vortex motion law of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 200(2):249–274, 1999.
[28] E. Miot. Dynamics of vortices for the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation. *Anal. PDE*, 2(2):159–186, 2009.
[29] J. C. Neu. Vortices in complex scalar fields. *Phys. D*, 43(2-3):385–406, 1990.
[30] L. Nirenberg. Remarks on strongly elliptic partial differential equations. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 8(4):648–674, 1955.
[31] L. Peres and J. Rubinstein. Vortex dynamics in U(1) Ginzburg-Landau models. *Phys. D*, 64(1-3):299–309, 1993.
[32] B. Y. Rubinstein and L. M. Pismen. Vortex motion in the spatially inhomogeneous conservative Ginzburg-Landau model. *Phys. D*, 78(1-2):1–10, 1994.
[33] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty. Gamma-convergence of gradient flows with applications to Ginzburg-Landau. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 57(12):1627–1672, 2004.
[34] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty. A product-estimate for Ginzburg-Landau and corollaries. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 211(1):219–244, 2004.
[35] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty. *Vortices in the magnetic Ginzburg-Landau model*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 70. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2007.
[36] K. Schwarz. Three-dimensional vortex dynamics in superfluid He 4: Line-line and line-boundary interactions. *Physical Review B*, 31(9):5782, 1985.
[37] S. Serfaty and I. Tice. Ginzburg-Landau vortex dynamics with pinning and strong applied currents. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 201(2):413–464, 2011.
[38] D. Spirn. Vortex motion law for the Schrödinger-Ginzburg-Landau equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 34(6):1435–1476 (electronic), 2003.
[39] M. Struwe. On the asymptotic behavior of minimizers of the Ginzburg-Landau model in 2 dimensions. *Differential Integral Equations*, 7(5-6):1613–1624, 1994.
[40] M. Taylor. *Partial differential equations I: Basic Theory*, volume 115. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
[41] M. Tsubota and S. Maekawa. Pinning and depinning of two quantized vortices in superfluid He 4. *Physical Review B*, 47(18):12040, 1993.
[42] E. Yarmchuk and R. Packard. Photographic studies of quantized vortex lines. *Journal of Low Temperature Physics*, 46(5-6):479–515, 1982.

E-mail address: matthias.kurzke@nottingham.ac.uk

E-mail address: marzuola@math.unc.edu

E-mail address: spirn@math.umn.edu

Mathematics Department, UNC, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Mathematics Department, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom